



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/668,652	09/22/2000	Chris E. Johnson	1756 (USW0587PUS)	2084

22193 7590 01/20/2004

QWEST COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL INC
LAW DEPT INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP
1801 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 3800
DENVER, CO 80202

EXAMINER

ELALLAM, AHMED

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2662

DATE MAILED: 01/20/2004

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/668,652

Applicant(s)

JOHNSON ET AL.

Examiner

AHMED ELALLAM

Art Unit

2662

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 September 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 September 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because:

The drawings of figures 1-3 are missing descriptive labels.

In figure 2, the numeral character "50" is not shown as indicated on page 6, second line.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "computer telephony interface platform" must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from claim(s) 4. No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 5, line 15 the phrase "demultiplexed service site" need correction. It is data that usually get multiplexed or demultiplexed and not an apparatus.

On page 7, line 3, the word "are" should be area.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 8 and 19 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim 1. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Because the limitation of "wide area network access device" was disclosed with reference to figure 3 as being the gateway. See page 7, paragraph 1 and 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 27, it is not clear what is meant by the phrase " the reformatted information is sent to a service platform comprising a computer telephony interface platform", because the information is already formatted, it is not clear what is the relationship between the formatted information and the computer telephony interface platform.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-5, 8-16, 19-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted prior art, Figure 1, page 1, lines 6-17, page 4, lines 18-25, and page 5, lines 1-22 over White et al, US (6,069,890).

Regarding claims 1, 5, with reference to figure 1 of prior art, prior art discloses a communication system 20 comprising:

A remote site comprising:

A plurality of subscribers 28;

A switch 30 (hereinafter first switch) interconnecting the plurality of subscribers; A multi-line hunt group 26 connected to the switch;

A service site 24 in connection with the hunt group 26; the service site comprising service platform 36 providing voice services;

It is inherent that the service site has a switch (herein after second switch) connected to the multi-line hunt group 26, because that is needed for signal switching over the hunt group.

The prior art does not disclose having a gateway connected to the first switch and a second gateway connected to the second switch and a data network in between the gateways.

However, White with reference to figure 4 and 8, discloses a gateway routers 104 and 116 interconnected by the Internet 106.

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the gateway routers taught by White in the system of prior art so that Internet telephony can be implemented.

Regarding claim 2, prior art discloses that service platform comprises a voicemail support, see page 5, lines 16-22.

Regarding claim 3, prior art discloses that service platform provides unified messaging service, see page 5, lines 16-22.

Regarding claim 4, Prior art does not disclose that the service site comprises a computer telephony interface platform.

However, White discloses that the destination gateway router transmit voice packets to voice enabled computer 127, see column 11, lines 12-40.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary person of skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the service site of prior art with the computer telephony processor taught by White so that telephone to computer and computer-to-computer voice services can be provided.

Regarding claims 8 and 19, the gateway device disclosed by White is wide area network device.

Regarding claim 9, Prior art discloses that the multilane hunt group comprises a plurality of voice communication lines and at least a signaling line.

Regarding claims 10 and 11, White in view of prior art discloses substantially all the limitation of parent claim 9, except that Prior art does not disclose gateways that convert voice and signaling received over the hunt group to a data format acceptable by the communication network.

However, White further discloses that source gateway router converts voice and signaling to a TCP/IP packet over the data network 106. See column 8, lines 58-67 and column 9, lines 1-5.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the gateway routers of White with the feature of TCP/IP-PSTN conversions so that PSTN services can be provided using the Internet.

Regarding claim 12, White in view of prior art does not disclose tunneling for signaling data exchange.

However, Examiner takes official notice that tunneling protocol is widely used for the exchange of signaling data. Since official notice is taken, it would have been obvious to a person of skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the gateway of With/prior-art use a tunneling protocol for signaling exchange so that faster connection set up through the data network can be achieved.

Regarding claim 13, in addition to the limitation discussed above with reference to parent claim 1, White further discloses software that provides compression decompression of voice information at terminal devices. See column 2, lines 43-57.

Therefore it would have been obvious to an ordinary person of skill in the art, to provide the compression/decompression software disclosed by White implemented in

the gateways instead of terminal devices as a design choice and to further system capacity.

Regarding claim 14, in addition to the limitation discussed above with reference to parent claim 1, White further discloses that source and destination gateways performs DS0 mapping to map individual channels across the data network. See column 7, lines 12-38.

Therefore it would have been obvious to an ordinary person of skill in the art, to further provide the system of prior art in addition to the gateway and the data network, with the DS0 mapping of White so that voice carried over the internet can be recovered to its analogue form.

Regarding claims 15, 16, 23 and 28, with reference to figure 1 of prior art, prior art discloses a communication system 20 for transmitting audible messages comprising:

A locality of subscribers unit 28;

A switch 30 (hereinafter first switch) interconnecting the subscribers units ; the switch routing traffic outside of the locality of subscriber units over at least multi-line hunt group 26 connected to the switch; the multi-line hunt group including a plurality of voice communication lines and a signaling line carrying signaling data;

Prior art does not disclose a gateway in communication with the multi-line hunt group and an IP based communication network, and the gateway converting voice information received over the hunt group to a data format acceptable by the communication network (claimed formatting as in claim 23).

However, with reference to figure 8, White in the same field of endeavor discloses a gateway router 104 in connection with the Internet 106, and that the gateway router convert voice and signaling to a TCP/IP packet over the data network 106. See column 8, lines 58-67 and column 9, lines 1-5.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the gateway router of White with the feature of TCP/IP-PSTN conversions in prior art system so that PSTN services can be provided using the Internet.

Regarding claim 20, White in view of prior art does not disclose tunneling for signaling data exchange.

However, Examiner takes official notice that tunneling protocol is widely used for the exchange of signaling data. Since official notice is taken, it would have been obvious to a person of skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the gateway of With/prior-art use a tunneling protocol for signaling exchange so that faster connection set up through the data network can be achieved.

Regarding claim 21, in addition to the limitation discussed above with reference to parent claim 15, White further discloses software that provides compression decompression of voice information at terminal devices. See column 2, lines 43-57.

Therefore it would have been obvious to an ordinary person of skill in the art, to provide the compression/decompression software disclosed by White implemented in the gateway instead of terminal devices as a design choice and to further system capacity.

Regarding claim 22, in addition to the limitation discussed above with reference to parent claim 15, White further discloses that the gateway router performs DS0 mapping to map individual channels across the data network. See column 7, lines 12-38.

Therefore it would have been obvious to an ordinary person of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to further provide the system of prior art in addition to the gateway and the data network, with the DS0 mapping of White so that voice carried over the Internet can be recovered to its analogue form.

Regarding claims 24 and 25, Prior art does not disclose receiving the formatted information over a data network and reformatting the data to its original form to be sent to a multiline hunt group.

However, with reference to figure 8, White further discloses receiving the TCP/IP packets (claimed formatted information) over the Internet 106, and reformatting the TCP/IP into the original format and a T1 (119) connection the switch 121. White further discloses a Multiline hunt group 584 in connection with a voice mail system 576. See column 8, lines 58-67 and column 9, lines 1-5.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary person of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to implement the teaching of TCP/IP gateway teaching of White applied in the prior art system so that PSTN services can be carried out using the Internet.

Regarding claim 26, Prior art discloses a unified messaging platform, see page 5, lines 16-22.

Regarding claim 27, Prior art does not disclose reformatted data is sent to service site comprising a computer telephony interface platform.

However, White discloses that the destination gateway router transmit voice packets to voice enabled computer 127, see column 11, lines 12-40.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary person of skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the service site of prior art with the computer telephony processor taught by White so that telephone to computer and computer-to-computer voice services can be provided.

6. Claim 6, 7, 17, 18, 29, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over prior art as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Benson et al, US (6,532,235).

Regarding claims 6, 17 and 29, White in view of prior art discloses substantially all the limitations of the parent claims 1, 15 and 23 respectively, except it does not disclose that the data network carries voice over frame relay (VoFR).

However, Benson with reference to figure 2, discloses a frame relay network 24 for carrying voice over frame relay. See column 2, lines 1-13.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary person of skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the data network of White/prior-art being a frame relay for carrying VoFR as disclosed by Benson so that fast voice packet delivery can be provided.

Regarding claims 7, 18 and 30, White in view of prior art discloses substantially all the limitations of the parent claims 1, 15 and 23 respectively, except it does not disclose that the data network carries voice over ATM (VoATM).

However, Benson discloses carrying voice over an ATM network. See column 3, lines 36-65.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary person of skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the data network of White/prior-art being an ATM network carrying VoATM similar to that taught by Benson so that better use of bandwidth allocation can be provided.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Bartholomew et al, US (6,215,858); Oran, US (6,275,574); Naudus, US (6,259,691); Ford, US (6,463,051); Carew et al, US (6,512,764), Chung et al, US (6,584,108).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AHMED ELALLAM whose telephone number is (703) 308-6069. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kizou Hassan can be reached on (703) 305-4744. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit: 2662

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

AHMED ELALLAM
Examiner
Art Unit 2662
December 30, 2003



HASSAN KIZOU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600